

### **SUMMARY OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for granting an interview on July 21, 2008. No exhibits were displayed or demonstrations shown. Claims 1, 3, 8, 15, 22, and 29-32 were discussed, as was cited reference to Doleac (US 6,668,053).

Applicant contemplated amending the independent claims to include “wherein the business requirement necessitates a change of telecommunications services in a geographical area”. The Examiner stated that further distinction should be made. The Examiner also suggested that the method claims might be amended to be system claims.

### **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application. Claims 1, 3-9, and 32 have been amended herein. Claims 2 and 15-31 have been cancelled herein. Claims 1, 3-14, and 32 are pending.

### **Objections**

Claim 9 was objected to because of the following informality: line 3, the work “demands” should be changed to “commands”. Claim 9 is amended herein to correct this informality.

### **Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Doleac et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,668,053). The rejection is traversed based, at least in part, on the above amendments and the following remarks.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP § 2131.

Applicant respectfully submits that Doleac et al. does not provide each and every element of independent claims 1, 8 and 32 as amended.

Doleac et al. does not disclose a system for use in a network computer environment for implementing a business requirement, “wherein the business requirement necessitates a change of at least one telecommunication service in a geographic area, and wherein said change impacts a plurality subscribers associated with said telecommunications network” as now recited in independent **claims 1 and 8**. As recited in the Specification on pages 18-19 lines 9-20 and 5-7 respectively, business requirements include setting up call routing in

one or more telecommunications switches, setting up a new switch, or implementing new services on an existing switch. New services may include items such as adding a new area code to a geographic area. Doleac et al. teaches a system that generates electronic commands to change subscriber services in a public switch telephone network (PSTN). Specifically, Doleac discloses translating a work order into a specific service for a specific subscriber (Col. 3 lines 39-49). Such work orders may include adding new telephone subscriber information, deleting service for a subscriber, and similar subscriber specific orders (Col 4: 26-31). Thus, the Doleac reference is not directed to fulfilling business requirements relating to telecommunication services impacting a plurality of subscribers in an entire geographical area as recited in claims 1 and 8. For at least these reasons, claims 1 and 8 are allowable.

Independent **claim 32**, as amended, recites “a service interpreter component for receiving a plurality of data and a service identification, wherein said service identification corresponds to the task to be performed by the computing device, wherein said data is manipulated specifically for the computing device, wherein said service identification is used to identify the tables that need to be loaded with said data, and wherein said task relates to a change of at least one telecommunication service in a geographic area, wherein said change impacts a plurality of subscribers of said telecommunications network”. Doleac discloses in column 3 lines 39-49 that a work order is to be translated into a specific service for a specific customer. Therefore, the task disclosed by Doleac a task relating to a specific subscriber and not to the implementation or modification of telecommunication services in a geographic area impacting a plurality a subscribers as recited by **claim 32**. For at least this reason, claim 32 is allowable.

Dependent claims 3-7 and 9-14 are allowable at least based on their dependency on allowable independent claims.

## **CONCLUSION**

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1, 3-14, and 32 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-559-2173 or jcamacho@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jesse J. Camacho/

Jesse J. Camacho  
Reg. No. 51,258

JJC/ksd  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.  
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613  
816-474-6550